

### **REMARKS**

This reply is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated March 4, 2010. Reconsideration is requested.

#### **Drawings**

The drawing is objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because it fails to show references to component “2” (the figure incorrectly labeled gas/liquid separator as reference component “11” instead of “2”) and component “17” as described in the specification. Applicants have corrected the drawing accordingly by providing a “New Sheet”, herewith, and ask that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### **Section 103 Rejection**

Claims 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,303,841 to Senetar et al. (hereinafter “Senetar”). The Applicants traverse, as now certain process steps have been modified by the transitional phrase “consisting essentially of.”

In particular, Applicants note that the Examiner at page 6 of the Office Action states that the previous arguments are not “persuasive because [] one does not desire to remove CO<sub>2</sub> from the olefin stream then the adsorption step may be omitted.” However, it is not CO<sub>2</sub> that is desired to be removed, but oxygenates (defined at paragraph [0019]) such as dimethyl ether, as discussed in the “Background” and at paragraphs [0010] to [0013] and throughout the specification.

In viewing the Applicant’s specification, it is clear that the intent of the invention is to avoid absorbents. In the “Background” at paragraph [0003], the Applicant states that:

For this reason a costly secondary purification of the reaction product is necessary. One oxygenate that is particularly to be taken into account is dimethyl ether (DME), since it is one of the lightest oxygenates and behaves similarly to C<sub>3</sub> in distillation processes. Moreover, it is only slightly polar, so it can be difficult to remove by absorption. Accordingly, it would be

beneficial to find additional methods to more easily remove oxygenates from olefins, particularly from an olefin stream synthesized from methanol.

To reiterate, the Applicant is taking special account of the presence of DME, among other “oxygenates” which cannot be removed by absorbents such as disclosed in *Senetar*, the presence of which only adds to the cost of the system without corresponding benefit.

Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated, since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned. If necessary to affect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to affect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1712 (Docket #: 2001B133 US).

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
June 4, 2010  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
/Kevin M. Faulkner/  
Kevin M. Faulkner  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 45,427

Post Office Address (to which all correspondence is to be sent)  
ExxonMobil Chemical Co.  
*Law Technology*  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149  
Phone: 281-834-5933  
Fax: 281-834-2495